



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2023

by J D Clark BA (Hons) DpTRP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/22/3307176

Green Oak Barn, Faintree, Bridgenorth, Shropshire WV16 6RQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Jonathan Stackhouse of Prime Oak Ltd against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref 22/03024/FUL, dated 28 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey oak framed extension to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons

3. Green Oak Barn is a detached two storey dwelling that has been converted from a former barn. It is accessed from a long track and is set behind a gated entrance. The long linear building is constructed using a mix of facing materials including stone, brickwork and timber.
4. The building originally formed part of Upper Faintree Farm which I am told is recorded on the Historic Environment Record as part of the Historic Farmsteads Characterisation Project. I have not had sight of this record but have no reason to question the building's inclusion in it. Although the building is now a dwelling, its history is reflected in its form and appearance and so its character is that of a converted barn. This contributes to the significance of the building as a non-designated heritage asset.
5. The appellant points out that the dwelling is no longer linked to the farmstead and argues that the conversion works have eroded its original agricultural appearance. He also states that the works have created individual domestic plots with boundary fences and gates so that the property now appears as a separate individual private dwelling. However, although the conversion works have altered the appearance of the former barn and its relationship to Upper Faintree Farm, the building still retains the character of a former barn.
6. Planning permission has previously been granted for a rear extension¹; this permission is extant. The main difference between the approved extension and

¹ Planning Application Ref: 22/01069/FUL.

that proposed now is its roof. The approved scheme would have a flat roof whereas the current scheme would have a hipped roof with the addition of a roof lantern.

7. Whilst the approved scheme is simple in its design, the proposal would introduce a roof shape, a hipped roof, and a design feature, in the form of the lantern, that would be at odds with the simple form and massing of the dwelling. Although the building is no longer a barn, the proposal introduces features that would jar with the original building and its current appearance. The lantern in particular would constitute a domestic element that is alien to the historic use of the building.
8. Furthermore, the height of the roof and lantern would partly obscure an upper floor window and although the plans give only a two dimensional representation, the effect of this would be to further detract from the simple form of the rear elevation. The extension would be visible from the access track outside the entrance gates and its roof profile, particularly when seen against the gable elevation, would appear incongruous and unsympathetic.
9. The extension would be proportionally smaller than the existing dwelling and in terms of its size it would appear subservient. Likewise, the overall appearance of Green Oak Barn would still retain its original character in that there would be no alterations to its front elevation. However, the extension would include features, as explained above, that would stand out in stark contrast to the simple rear elevation of the property. The addition of these features would have a harmful effect on the significance of the non-designated heritage asset which I have afforded significant weight to.
10. I note the sustainable credentials of the proposal including the appellant's intention to use traditional oak framing obtained from responsibly managed renewal FSC certified forests and that traditional carpentry methods would be used. Also reclaimed roof tiles are proposed and the appellant intends to utilise water butts for the recycling of rainwater. However, whilst this sustainable approach would be consistent with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework², this does not add sufficient weight to overcome the harm I have identified.
11. To conclude, the proposal would have a materially harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling. This would conflict with Core Strategy³ policies CS6 and CS17 which, amongst other things, seek to protect the built and historical environment. There is also conflict with SAMDev⁴ policies MD2 and MD13 which aim to protect and, wherever possible, avoid harm or loss of significance to designated or non-designated heritage assets in line with the objectives of the Framework in relation to the historic environment.

² Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government National Planning Policy Framework, 2021 (the Framework).

³ Shropshire Council – Shropshire Local Development Framework : Adopted Core Strategy, March 2011.

⁴ Shropshire Council – Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan, Adopted Plan 17 December 2015.

Other Matters

12. I note that no harm has been identified with regard to any impact on neighbouring dwellings or the wider countryside. The absence of harm is a neutral factor in the overall planning balance.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having regard to the development plan and all other considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR